UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,780	0 10/10/2006 Janez Kerc		029489-00023	1166
4372 ARENT FOX I	7590 08/26/201 LP	0	EXAMINER	
	TICUT AVENUE, N.	ARNOLD, ERNST V		
SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1613	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/590,780	KERC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ERNST V. ARNOLD	1613	

	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1613	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		= 1	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 (apperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abai t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWC
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	lianas with 27 OFD 44 27 most bar	Clark within two wanth	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* ***	maliant Amandmant (DTOL 224\
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imaly filed emendmen	at concelling the
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable il submitted in a separate, i	inely filed afficilidine	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13,14 and 17-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-12,15 and 16</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. \(\sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered bu \(\sum \) See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/Ernst V Arnold/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1613	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 14 has been amended to recite previoulsy un-examined functional langauge which would require further serach and consideration. It also appears that this amendment broadens the disclosed subject matter and therefore a new matter rejection appears to be appropriate. The specification as filed only mentions a tablet that meets this limitation, but the claim langauge is drawn to all compositions. Nothing has been shown that aqueous solutions of the pravastatin sodium have the same stability. It appears that this broadens the disclosed subject matter and therefore a new matter rejection appears to be appropriate.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendment requires further search and consideration. The specification on page 18, example 19 discloses that a tablet subjected to accelerated stability testing at 60 C for one month was stable but no comparative data has been provided for similar prior art compositions and the claims embrace all compositions including liquid, emulsion, suspension etc... which probably don't have the same parameters as instantly claimed and therefore a scope of enablement rejection is most likely forthcoming. The present rejections of record would have to be reconsidered in light of the new amendments. Respectfully, for at least the reasons above, the case is not in condition for allowance and claims 13, 14 and 17-21 remain rejected.